



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,407	12/28/2000	James S. Lipscomb	SOM920000015US1/1963-7407	5258
7590	01/09/2007			EXAMINER
William E Lewis				O STEEN, DAVID R
Ryans Mason & Lewis LLP				
90 Forest Avene			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Locust Valley, NY 11560			2623	
				MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/749,407

Applicant(s)

LIPSCOMB ET AL.

Examiner

David R. O'Steen

Art Unit

2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. Other: _____.

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Part of Paper No. 20061229

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the applicant's remarks, filed December 5, the applicant traverses on page 3 the rejection of Claim 39. Specifically, the applicant argues that Naimpally fails to address the limitations not met by Finseth. The applicant argues that Naimpally fails to address the limitation of "channels specified ... as selected by the system" because the selected program categories are originally selected by the user. Despite the applicant's concerns, the examiner maintains this rejection. The examiner would like to reiterate the although the examiner inputs the selection, the selection is made by the system. Please see pages 2 and 3 of the non-final rejection mailed of December 29, 2005 for more explanation. Also, the applicant traverses the Official Notice stating the obviousness of the "profile of the viewer is deduced by the system television viewing habits of the viewer." The examiner maintains that this feature is, indeed, well known. In fact, Brown, relied on elsewhere in the final rejection, discloses such a feature in column 13, lines 53-59. On page 5 of the remarks section, the applicant further argues that Brown fails to disclose "the selection of a classification category by the system ... from a plurality of classification categories for the interactive television content being viewed." Again, the examiner must disagree. In Brown, the system clearly selects a category and even shows it to the user (See Fig. 9B). The examiner maintains that this meets the limitation found in Claim 39. The applicant also traverses the rejections of Claims 40-44, 1-14, 16-22, and 24-38 for the same reasons as discussed above. The applicant's concerns regarding these claims have, therefore, already been addressed.